

Appln. No. 09/927,345  
Amd. dated September 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

prior to the filing date of Yu (March 23, 2001), and that the Applicants worked on the invention diligently during a period starting prior to March 23, 2001, and finishing with actual reduction to practice, which took place no later than April 25, 2001. Consequently, Yu may not be considered "prior art" against the present patent application. As the rejection depends on Yu being "prior art", the rejection falls, whereby claims 1-36 are patentable over the cited art.

Applicants believe the remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all points raised in the Action, including all grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these remarks and the Declaration filed herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jaa  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\bn\c\colb\RIBAK1\PTO\Amd 2Se05.doc